

REMARKS

All pending claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over various combination of U.S. patents of Heddaya, Smith, Ganguly, Eichstaedt, Reiche, Lapstun, Birnbaum, and Genty. Applicant respectfully submits that all the above cited references do not teach or suggest all the limitations of the claims as amended.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Independent claims 1, 23, 49, 63, 70 and 71 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Heddaya, Smith and Ganguly. Independent claim 58 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Heddaya, Smith, Ganguly and Reiche.

Claim 1 recites “wherein the act of prefabricating the first page comprises sending a request for information of the first page, wherein the request comprises a page request block (PRB) and is transmitted at a rate based on system resource information.” (Emphasis added). None of the cited references disclose or suggest these limitations.

The Office action dated July 21, 2008 states that claim 95 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 1 as amended includes the subject matter of claim 95, which the Office action indicated to include allowable subject matter, with all the limitations of its base claim.

Claims 49, 58, and 63 recite similar limitations as claim 1. Claims 23, 70-71, and 73-74 are the system and computer program product claims that parallel the above method claims and thus are believed to be allowable over the cited references for at least the foregoing reasons. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 23, 49, 58, 63, 70-71, and their respective dependent claims are believed to be allowable over the cited references.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejections be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, all remaining claims are in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding this response, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

To the extent that any arguments and disclaimers were presented to distinguish prior art, or for other reasons substantially related to patentability, during the prosecution of any and all parent and related application(s)/patent(s), Applicant(s) hereby explicitly retracts and rescinds any and all such arguments and disclaimers, and respectfully requests that the Examiner re-visit the prior art that such arguments and disclaimers were made to avoid.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge Vista IP Law Group LLP Account No. **50-1105** for any fees required that are not covered, in whole or in part, and to credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account No. **50-1105**.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 21, 2008

By: /Jasper Kwoh/
Jasper Kwoh
Registration No. 54,921

Vista IP Law Group LLP
1885 Lundy Avenue,
Suite 108
San Jose, CA 95131
Telephone: (408) 321-8663